

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 and 6-36 are now pending in the application. Claims 1, 2, 3, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 36 are now amended. Claim 4 is now cancelled. The claim amendments are fully supported by the application as filed and do not present new subject matter. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

DRAWING OBJECTION

The drawings stand objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) because “the ‘retarder disposed between the first absorptive polarizer and the electro-optical panel’ found in claim 31 must be shown.”

Applicants submit that the “retarder” is not recited in Claim 31. However, this feature is recited in Claim 30. Thus, Applicants assume that the Examiner intended to cite Claim 30.

Applicants now amend Claim 30 to recite, with reference to Figure 1 for exemplary purposes only as the invention includes numerous embodiments, “a retarder [130] disposed between the reflective polarizer [110] and the electro-optical panel [140].”

Applicants submit that the features of amended Claim 30 are shown in the figures. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this drawing objection.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 7 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 7 stands rejected because it recites that the second polarized light selecting unit reflects the fourth polarized light, while unamended Claim 3 upon which Claim 7 depends recited that the second polarized light selecting unit only absorbs a fourth polarized light. As a result, the Office Action states that Claim 7 falls outside of the scope set forth by Claim 3.

Applicants now amend Claim 3 to recite that the second polarized light selecting unit one of absorbs and reflects a fourth polarized light. Therefore, Claim 7 now falls within the scope set by Claim 3.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this Section 112 rejection of Claim 7.

Claim 30 stands rejected because “applicant has failed to [show] how the retarder (element 130 or 230) [is] between the first absorptive polarizer and the liquid crystal panel in the specification.”

Applicants now amend Claim 30 to recite, with reference to Figure 1 for exemplary purposes only as the invention includes numerous embodiments, “a retarder [130] disposed between the reflective polarizer [110] and the electro-optical panel [140].”

Applicants’ submit that amended Claim 30 complies with Section 112. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 112 rejection of Claim 30 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 7-8, 10, 12, 14, 18, and 23-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kaneko et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,525,707). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claims 1, 3, 26, and 28 are now amended to recite the allowable subject matter of Claim 4. Therefore, Claims 1, 3, 26, and 28 are now in a condition for allowance at least for including the allowable subject matter of Claim 4.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this Section 102 rejection of independent Claims 1, 3, 26, and 28 and those claims dependent therefrom.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 15-16 and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaneko in view of Higuchi (U.S. Pat. No. 6,222,689).

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaneko in view of Miyake et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,902,103).

Claims 9, 19, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaneko in view of Kusuda (U.S. Pat. No. 6,559,902).

Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaneko in view of Kusuda and further in view of Suzuki (U.S. Pat. No. 6,573,957).

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 36 is now amended to include the allowable subject matter of Claim 4. Therefore, Claim 36 is now in a condition for allowance at least for including the allowable subject matter of Claim 4.

The remainder of the claims rejected under Section 103 are dependent upon amended Claim 3. As set forth above, Claim 3 is now amended to include the allowable subject matter of Claim 4. Therefore, the claims are now in a condition for allowance at least for including the allowable subject matter of Claim 4.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this Section 103 rejection.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner states that Claims 4, 6, 11, 13, 22, and 34 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants thank the Examiner for recognizing the patentable features of these claims. Applicants wish to point out that the claims are in a condition for allowance for numerous reasons in addition to those set forth in the Office Action.

Applicants submit that Claim 34 is already in independent form. Therefore, Claim 34 is in a condition for allowance.

Applicants now amend independent Claims 1, 3, 26, 28, and 36 to include the allowable subject matter of Claim 4. Therefore, Claims 1, 3, 26, 28, and 36 and those claims dependent therefrom are now in a condition for allowance at least for including the allowable subject matter of Claim 4.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Jan 4, 2006

Harness, Dickey & Pierce, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600
GGS/BEW/BGS/les

By: 

G. Gregory Schiely, Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade, Reg. No. 40,344